

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF GEORGIA
SAVANNAH DIVISION**

DAVID OCHOA JARA,)	
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	
v.)	CV420-256
)	
UNITED STATES)	
DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND)	
SECURITY, BUREAU OF)	
IMMIGRATION AND CUSTOM)	
ENFORCEMENT (ICE),)	
)	
Defendant.)	

REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION

Plaintiff, appearing *pro se*, has submitted a motion for a declaration that he is a derivative United States citizen and to appoint counsel. Doc. 1. He seeks to proceed *in forma pauperis* (IFP). Doc. 3. Petitioner has failed to provide any of the required information needed to support his IFP application. In fact, the only sections of the submitted application not left blank were the date and his signature. *Id.* at 2. As the plaintiff has not established his indigency, the motion to proceed IFP should be **DENIED.**

While a plaintiff need not be absolutely destitute in order to proceed IFP, *Adkins v. E.I. Dupont de Nemours*, 335 U.S. 331, 339 (1948), the fact that financing his own litigation may cause some difficulty is not sufficient to relieve a plaintiff of his obligation to pay his own way where it is possible to do so without undue hardship. *Thomas v. Secretary of Dep't of Veterans Affairs*, 358 F. App'x 115, 116 (11th Cir. 2009) (the Court has wide discretion in ruling on IFP application, and should grant the privilege "sparingly" in civil cases for damages). Two important points must be underscored. First, proceeding IFP is a privilege, not an entitlement. *See Rowland v. Cal. Men's Colony, Unit II Men's Advisory Council*, 506 U.S. 194, 198 (1993). Second, courts have discretion to afford litigants IFP status; it's not automatic. 28 U.S.C. § 1915(a)(1) (courts "may authorize the commencement" of IFP actions); *Denton v. Hernandez*, 504 U.S. 25, 31 (1992); *see also Marceaux v. Democratic Party*, 79 F. App'x 185, 186 (6th Cir. 2003) (no abuse of discretion when court determined plaintiff could afford to pay the filing fee without undue hardship because he has no room and board expenses, owns a car, and spends the \$250.00 earned each month selling plasma on completely discretionary items); *Lee v. McDonald's Corp.*, 231 F.3d 456, 458 (8th Cir.


2000) (the decision of whether to grant or deny IFP status under 28 U.S.C. § 1915 is discretionary). Plaintiff has provided no evidence to support his claim of indigency. Accordingly, his application to proceed *in forma pauperis* should be **DENIED**. Doc. 3.

This R&R is submitted to the district judge assigned to this action, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and this Court's Local Rule 72.3. Within 14 days of service, any party may file written objections to the R&R with the Court and serve a copy on all parties. The document should be captioned "Objections to Magistrate Judge's Report and Recommendations." Any request for additional time to file objections should be filed with the Clerk for consideration by the assigned district judge. In the alternative, within the same period, plaintiff may supplement his IFP application with all of the solicited information.

After the objections period has ended, the Clerk shall submit this R&R together with any objections to the assigned district judge. The district judge will review the magistrate judge's findings and recommendations pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C). The parties are advised that failure to timely file objections will result in the waiver of rights on appeal. 11th Cir. R. 3-1; *see Symonette v. V.A. Leasing Corp.*,

648 F. App'x 787, 790 (11th Cir. 2016); *Mitchell v. United States*, 612 F. App'x 542, 545 (11th Cir. 2015).

SO REPORTED AND RECOMMENDED, this 4th day of
November, 2020.



CHRISTOPHER L. RAY
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF GEORGIA